

**REMARKS**

**I. Formal Matters**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, 17, 23 and 27-37 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 9-11, 17, 23 and 27-29. Applicant also cancels claims 24-26 and adds new claims 30-37. Ample support for the newly added claims can be found throughout the specification.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the receipt of priority documents submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous telephonic interview on March 13, 2007. An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was provided to the Applicant on March 16, 2007. The PTO-413 requires Applicant to file a Statement of Substance of the Interview. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows:

During the interview, claims 1, 9, 27 and 28 were discussed in view of Berger U.S. Pat. No. 6,414,693. Specifically, with regard to claim 1, the Examiner broadly interprets the term "attribute of a user" to include the name, or identity, of the user. As such, the Examiner asserts that a user's identity is "inherently associated" with the user's order, which the Examiner believes corresponds to "classifying said attached correction data based on an attribute of the user" of claim 1. The Examiner suggested several possible amendments.

With regard to claim 9, the Examiner mentioned a possible § 112 problem and stated that claim 9, if amended with regard to the § 112 problem, would require further search and consideration to determine patentability.

**II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner has rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 27 has been amended to correspond to amended claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of claim 27 is now moot.

With regard to claim 9, claim 9 has been amended as requested by the Examiner in the telephonic interview of March 13, 2007.

**III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, 17 and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Berger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,414,693). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner, in the Interview of March 13, 2007 stated that a user's identity is "inherently associated" with the user's order, which then allegedly corresponds to "classifying said attached correction data based on an attribute of the user" of claim 1.

In light of Examiner's position, claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the differences between Berger and the present invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that Berger does not teach, or even suggest, at least "receiving an electronic submission associated with a specific user to which said correction data and additional personal information of the specific

user is attached ... classifying said attached correction data based on the additional personal information of the specific user recited in said received electronic submission and registering said correction data in said data base based on the classification results,” as recited in claim 1.

That is, each electronic submission is associated with a specific user, and that specific user provides additional personal information, wherein the system classifies the correction data based on that additional personal information. As such, Applicant submits that the “additional personal information” cannot be interpreted as the “name, or identification, of the user” because a specific user is already associated with the correction data, and thus the specific user’s name or identification would not need to be included in the additional personal information provided in the electronic submission.

For at least the above reason, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art. As claims 2, 4, 10, 27, 28, 32 and 35 depend from claim 1 they are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. They are also allowable because of additional limitations set forth therein.

Applicant’s independent claim 11 is a method claim and is distinguished over Berger for reasons analogous to those recited for claim 1. Further, claim 29 depends from claim 11 and is therefore allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 11.

Applicant’s independent claim 17 is an apparatus claim and is distinguished over Berger for reasons analogous to those recited with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner further alleges that independent claim 9 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Berger. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Berger does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 9. For example, Berger does not teach or suggest at least “an information entry selecting means allowing a user to either, enter design information without downloading public design data, or request transfer of said public design data from the design data publicizing processing unit to the user together with an editing program file,” as recited in claim 9.

Instead, Berger simply allows the user to select a method of downloading public design data, either by picking a style from a menu list, or by entering a previously determined identifying number. There is no disclosure in Berger of an alternative to downloading the public design data. Therefore, claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Applicant’s claim 23 is a related independent server apparatus claim and is distinguished over Berger for reasons analogous to those recited with respect to claim 9.

With regard to the rejection of claims 24-26, those claims have been canceled, thus, the rejections pertaining to claims 24-26 are now moot.

#### IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 WITH  
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW  
U.S. Application No.: 09/781,253

Attorney Docket No.: Q63086

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant herewith petitions the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Unless a check is attached, any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl J. Pellegini  
Registration No. 40,766

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 12, 2007